

SMITH DRAY LINE

RECEIVED

ASHEVILLE

COLUMBIA

COLUMBIA, SC 29230

US (800) 332-5673

PO BOX 3247

PO BOX 5703 ASHEVILLE, NC 28813 US (800) 327-6310 DATE //30/08 PSC SC DOCKETING DEPT.

#PAGES (+COVERSHEET) 4

TO: Commissionar Fleming

FAX# 803 - 896 - 5246

FROM: B:11 Turrentine III

COMPANY: SMITH DRAY LINE



SUBJECT Docket 2007-421-T

IF YOU HAVE ANY QUESTIONS REGARDING THIS FAX PLEASE CALL OUR OFFICE AT 864-269-3696 OR 800-327-5673

GREENVILLE

PO BOX 2226 GREENVILLE, SC 29602 US (800) 327-5673

ROCK HILL

1421 DAVE LYLE BLVD. TECH PARK NORTH ROCK HILL, SC 29730 US (800) 288-2469

Jan. 30. 200	13_ 4:21FM			_No. 9545P. 2
STATE OF SO	OUTH CAROLINA	4 ·)		
(Caption of Case) Docket To propose a Maximum Rate Tariff			BEFORE THE PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION OF SOUTH CAROLINA TRANSPORTATION COVER SHEET	
for The Moving Industry in the State of S.C.) DOCKET) NUMBER: 2007 - 421 - T))	
Other:	Relief demanded in p		tem to be placed on Commis	ssion's Agenda expeditiously
INDUSTRI (C		NATURE OF ACTION (Check all that apply)		
Electric		Affidavit	Letter	Request
☐ Electric/Gas		Agreement	Memorandum	Request for Certification
Blectric/Teleco		Answer	☐ Motion	Request for Investigation
☐ Blectric/Water		Appellate Review	○ Objection	Resale Agreement
Electric/Water	Telecom.	Application	Petition	Resale Amendment
Electric/Water	/Sewer	☐ Brief	Petition for Reconsideration	on Reservation Letter
☐ Gas		Certificate	Petition for Rulemaking	Response
∐ Railroad		Comments	Petition for Rule to Show Ca	use Response to Discover
Sewer		Complaint Complaint	Petition to Intervene	Return to Petition
Telecommunic		Consent Order	Petition to Intervene Out of I	ime Stipulation
Transportation		Discovery	Prefiled Testimony	Subpoena
Water		Exhibit	Promotion	Tariff
☐ Water/Sewer		Expedited Consideration	Proposed Order	Other:
Administrative		Interconnection Agreement	Protest	
Other: Mou	ng + Storage	Interconnection Amendment	Publisher's Affidavit	
•	٠, ٠	Late-Filed Exhibit	Report	



SMITH DRAY LINE

ASHEVILLE

PO BOX 5703 ASHEVILLE, NC 28813 US (800) 327-6310

January 30, 2008

Public Service Commission Attn: Commissioner Fleming Docketing Department 101 Executive Center Drive Columbia, SC. 29210

RE: Docket #2007-421-T

Dear Commissioner Fleming,

COLUMBIA PO BOX 3247

COLUMBIA, SC 29230 US (800) 332-5673



GREENVILLÈ

PO BOX 2226 GREENVILLE, SC 29602 US (800) 327-5673

ROCK HILL

1421 DAVE LYLE BLVD TECH PARK NORTH ROCK HILL, SC 29730 US (800) 288-2469

The office of Regulatory for the state of S.C. has issued a proposal to adopt a maximum rate tariff system for the household goods industry in S.C. In light of the fact that the ORS did not ask for input from the movers of the state prior to issuing the docket, I ask that you will take into consideration my thoughts on this proposal.

The goal of the moving industry in S.C. has been to consistently provide superior levels of service to our customers at a fair price. Because the movers in this state have been able to concentrate more on service than price, due to a regulated tariff, we have in large part been able to meet our goal of consistency and superior service. This statement is strengthened when comparing the movers in S.C. to other movers in states using the max rate tariff system or who are fully deregulated. If a mover in the state of S.C. does not wish to be a part of the regulated tariff, the mover may file a separate tariff, thus promoting the free market system. The regulated tariff in S.C. has always been overseen by the PSC with changes to the tariff occurring only after extensive cost studies presented to and accepted by the PSC.

I feel a max tariff in this state will ultimately prove to be a detriment to the consumers down the road. While a max tariff may drop prices early on, the trickle down will be movers finding they can not operate at the prices being demanded, thus causing a deterioration within the industry in areas such as: consistency in service, claims paybacks, insurance coverage's, equipment and quality labor. A max rate tariff would be especially taxing on the smaller movers. I also feel that customers in the less populated areas will run into problems finding a mover to service them or wind up paying exorbitant prices to get moved because of their location.

Regulation equals consistency and a healthy moving industry is able to provide consistent high level service at a fair price, thus producing a satisfied customer. I don't understand the reasoning behind changing a system that has proven to have worked beneficially for both the moving industry and the consumer at the same time.

Thank you in advance for taking the time to give this letter some thought.

Sincerely,

Willie v Sumentin IT Bill Turrentine III

Vice President Smith Dray Line Moving & Storage President S.C. Tariff Bureau